,	,	Case 8:09-cv-01168-CJC-RNB Docum	nent 1	Filed 10/09/09		
					ORIGINA	
	1 2 3 4 5	MARLIN & SALTZMAN Stanley D. Saltzman, Esq. [SBN 900 Louis M. Marlin, Esq. [SBN 54053] Marcus J. Bradley, Esq. [SBN 17415 Christina A. Humphrey, Esq. [SBN 2 29229 Canwood Street, Suite 208 Agoura Hills, California 91301 (818) 991-8080 Fax: (818) 991-80 ssaltzman@marlinsaltzman.com	58] 66] 226326] 081	I	2009 OCT -9 SIERS U.S. BH CENTRAL DR LOS AN	FILED
					PH P	
	6	mbradley@marlinsaltzman.com chumphrey@marlinsaltzman.com			1 2: 46 FCALIF.	
	7 8	(Additional Counsel on next page)			LIF.	
	9	Attorneys for Plaintiff and Proposed	Class			Ė
	10	IN THE UNITED S	TATE	S DISTRICT (COURT	
	11	FOR THE CENTRAL				
	12			09-011		(A)
	13	JOHN S. PAULINO and all others		se No.:		
	14	similarly situated,	CL	ASS ACTION	(FRCP 23)	
	15	Plaintiff,			OR DAMAGES:	70
	16	v.] 1.	AND OVER		28
<i>-</i> 1	17	BANK OF AMERICA, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION;]	Commission	ATION (Welfare Orders and Labor , et seg., and 1194);	
-15	18	BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 to 10] 2.	RECOVER' AT THE AC	Y OF UNPAID WAO GREED RATE	
20	19	inclusive,]	(SECRET L Code §§221	OWER WAGE) (<i>La</i> -223);	bor
ſ	20	Defendants.] 3.	FAILURE T FOR MEAL	TO COMPENSATE LAND REST BREA	KS
14	21] 4.	(<i>Labor Code</i> FORFEITU	e §§226.7 and 512); RE OF VACATION	
1	22	·]		OLATION OF THE IIA LABOR CODE:	
	23		¹ 5.	FAILURE T	TO PROVIDE AN FE" ITEMIZED WA	GE
	24		1	STATEME	NT UPON PAYMEN S (Labor Code § 226	
	25		j 6.	FAILURE T		
	26		<u> </u>	OF TERMI	NATION (Labor Co	de
	27		¹ 7.	FAILURE 1 AND OVER	O PAY ALL WAG	ES
	28		1	ANDUVER		
			I		COMPLA CASE I	

	Case 8:09-cv-01168-CJC-RNB	Document 1	Filed 10/09/09 Page 2 of 32
1 2 3 4 5 6 7] 8. 9. 10	COMPENSATION IN VIOLATION OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT CONVERSION VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE §17200 PENALTIES PURSUANT TO PAGA UNDER (Labor Code §§2698, et seq.)
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
			COMPLAINT CASE NO.

1	l ' ' '
	Case 8:09-cv-01168-CJC-RNB Document 1 Filed 10/09/09 Page 3 of 32
1	Co-Counsel for Plaintiff and Proposed Class
2	LAW OFFICE OF SHAUN SETAREH, APC
3	Shaun Setareh, Esq. [SBN 204514] 9454 Wilshire Blyd., Penthouse Suite 3
	Beverly Hills, California 90212
4	(310) 888-7771 Fax: (310) 888-0109 setarehlaw@sbcglobal.net
5	LAW OFFICE OF LOUIS BENOWITZ
6	Louis Benowitz, Esq. [SBN 262300] 9454 Wilshire Blvd., Penthouse Suite 34
7	Beverly Hills, California 90212 (310) 888-7771 Fax: (310) 888-0109
8	louis@benowitzlaw.com
9	THE SPIVAK LAW FIRM David Spivak, Esg. [SBN 179684]
10	David Spivak, Esq. [SBN 179684] 9454 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 302 Beverly Hills, California, 90212
11	(310) 499-4730 Fax: (310) 499-4739 david@spivaklaw.com
12	duvid e sprvakia vioeni
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

COMPLAINT CASE NO.

Plaintiff John S. Paulino, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, complains and alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

- 1. Pursuant Fed.R.Civ.P. Rule 23 and California *Bus. & Prof. Code* section 17200, *et. seq.*, Plaintiffs have filed this action seeking class action treatment, to recover unpaid wages, penalties, and restitution from Defendants for their violations of, *inter alia*, California *Labor Code* §§ 500, 1194, 221-223, 226.7, 512, 227.3, 226, 201-203, 2698, et. seq.; Cal. *Bus. & Prof. Code* § 17200 et. seq.; the applicable Wage Order(s) issued by the California Industrial Welfare Commission (hereafter, the "IWC Wage Orders"); the Fair Labor Standards Act; and related common law principles.
- 2. This proposed Class Action lawsuit challenges the Defendants' employment practices with respect to its non-exempt employees in California and in the United States, primarily in that Defendants did not pay non-exempt employees for all hours worked. While employed by Defendants, Plaintiff and members of the proposed California and national classes were required to perform off-the-clock work and subject to alteration of time records by Defendants to reflect less hours than actually worked. Consequently, Plaintiff and members of the proposed class were not paid for all overtime hours worked, which may have also resulted in unpaid straight time as well.
- 3. This proposed Class Action lawsuit further challenges the Defendants' payroll practices with respect to its non-exempt employees in California and in the United States, primarily in that Defendants failed to accurately calculate the rates used for overtime and straight time of the Plaintiff and members of the proposed California and national classes. Among other things, Defendants' calculated rates failed to take into each employee's total remuneration including, but not limited to, bonus incentives earned as well as actual hours worked. Consequently, Plaintiff and

9

12 13

14 15

> 16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

28

members of the California and national proposed classes were not paid for all hours worked using the correct calculations.

- This proposed Class Action lawsuit further challenges numerous other 4. of Defendants' employment practices with respect to Plaintiff and proposed class members in California. Plaintiff and members of the proposed California classes were not provided with uninterrupted 30 minute meal periods on every day in which they worked more than five hours, were not provided with rest periods of ten minutes for each four hours of work, were not paid an additional hour of pay for every day they worked without a meal or rest period, were not provided with overtime pay at one and one half their regular rates of pay for all overtime hours worked, did not have all of their remuneration factored into their respective regular rates of pay for straight time and overtime payment purposes, were not provided with all vested vacation pay earned during employment, were not provided with accurate wage statements, had compensation secretly withheld from them, and/or were not paid all wages owed to them upon the termination of their employment.
- The Acts complained of herein have occurred, are presently occurring, 5. and are expected to continue occurring, within the time period from four (4) years preceding the filing of the original Complaint herein, up to and through the time of trial for this matter (hereinafter, the "Relevant Time Period").

JURISDICTION

- 6. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this class action under 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1367(a). Specifically, this action presents claims under the Federal Labor Standards Act (hereafter "FLSA") and accompanying state law claims under the California Labor Code, which form part of the same case or controversy under Article III, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution.
- 7. This Court also has original jurisdiction of this action under the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005. The amount-in-controversy exceeds the sum of

1

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

24

25

26

27

28

\$5,000,000 exclusive of interest and costs, and there is minimal diversity because certain members of the class are citizens of a different state than any defendant as required by 28 U.S.C. section 1332(d)(2).

VENUE

8. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391 because Defendants are (i) subject to personal jurisdiction in this District, and/or (ii) committed the wrongful conduct against certain members of the class in Orange County, California. At all relevant times, Defendants maintained offices and facilities in Orange County, California, and committed the wrongful conduct against members of the class in Orange County, California.

THE PARTIES AND CONDUCT

A. Plaintiff and Class Members

Plaintiff John S. Paulino (hereafter "Plaintiff") started working for 9. Defendant Bank of America, National Association and/or Defendant Bank of America Corporation (hereafter referred to collectively as "Bank of America" or "Defendants") in February, 2008, as a non-exempt employee "loan officer" at a Bank of America call center and continuously worked for Bank of America in that capacity until June, 2009. During his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff performed his duties as a loan officer at a Bank of America Call Center in Brea, California. While employed by Defendants, Plaintiff was required to perform off-the-clock work, including off-the-clock overtime work, was not provided with an uninterrupted 30 minute meal period on every day in which he worked more than five hours, was not provided with rest periods of ten minutes for each four hours of work, was not paid an additional hour of pay for every day he worked without a meal or rest period, was not given overtime pay for all overtime hours worked, did not have all of his remuneration factored into his regular rate of pay for overtime and straight time payment purposes, was not provided all vested vacation pay earned during his

16 17

14

15

20

21

19

18

22

23 24

25

26

27 28 employment, was not provided with accurate wage statements, had compensation secretly withheld from him, and was not paid all wages owed to him upon the termination of his employment. 10.

Class members are similarly situated persons employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees at retail banking centers who, during the applicable limitations periods, were required to perform off-the-clock work, were not provided with uninterrupted 30 minute meal periods on every day in which they worked more than five hours, were not provided with rest periods of ten minutes for each four hours of work, were not paid an additional hour of pay for every day they worked without a meal or rest period, were not provided with overtime pay at one and one half their regular rates of pay for all overtime hours worked, did not have all of their remuneration factored into their respective regular rates of pay for straight time and overtime payment purposes, were not provided with all vested vacation pay earned during employment, were not provided with accurate wage statements, had compensation secretly withheld from them, and/or were not paid all wages owed to them upon the termination of their employment.

В. **Defendants**

- Defendant Bank of America, National Association is a national 11. association organized under the laws of the United States which maintains its principal place of business in the State of North Carolina. At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Bank of America National Association conducted business operations and employed Plaintiff and other class members in the State of California and throughout the United States.
- 12. Defendant Bank of America conducted, and continues to conduct, substantial and regular business throughout California and also is an enterprise that affects commerce by engaging in nationwide banking in interstate commerce and by regularly and recurrently receiving or transmitting interstate

communications.

13. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships, and extent of participation in the conduct alleged herein, of the Defendants sued as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, but is informed and believes and thereon alleges that said Defendants are legally responsible for the wrongful conduct alleged herein and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants when ascertained.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

14. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 13 of this complaint as if fully alleged herein. Plaintiff seeks to represent the following class and sub-classes composed of and defined as follows:

Plaintiff Class:

All non-exempt employees who have been employed or are currently employed by Defendants in the United States within the Relevant Time Period. This definition excludes persons who perform or performed managerial duties. As used in this Class Definition, the term "non-exempt employee" refers to those who Defendant has classified as non-exempt employees.

California Sub-Class:

All non-exempt hourly employees who have been employed or are currently employed by Defendants in the state of California within the Relevant Time Period. This definition excludes persons who perform or performed managerial duties. As used in this Class

Definition, the term "non-exempt employee" refers to those who Defendant has classified as non-exempt employees.

California Terminated Sub-Class:

All non-exempt hourly California employees whose employment with Defendants terminated and did not receive all of the wages due them at the time of termination, and/or who did not receive their final wages in a timely manner as mandated by California law. This definition excludes persons who perform or performed managerial duties. As used in this Class Definition, the term "non-exempt employee" refers to those who Defendant has classified as non-exempt employees.

- 15. This action is brought and may be maintained as a class action under Rule 23(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- A. **Numerosity**: Class members are so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that there are more than 100 members in each class described above.
- B. **Commonality**: There are questions of law and fact common to class members. These questions include, but are not limited to:
- 1) Did Defendants have a policy or practice of requiring class members to perform off-the-clock work?
- 2) Did Defendants have policies encouraging management employees or those employees performing management duties to write down the time

- 13) Are class members entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants' alleged violations of the California *Labor Code*?
- C. **Typicality**: The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of other class members. Plaintiff has suffered the same or similar injuries as other class members based on a course of conduct which is not unique to Plaintiff but which has commonly affected other class members.
- D. Adequacy of Representative: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of other class members. Plaintiff does not have any conflicts of interest with other class members and Plaintiff will vigorously prosecute this action on behalf of other class members. Plaintiff is represented by legal counsel with substantial class action experience in civil litigation and employment law.
- 16. This case is brought and may be maintained as a class action under Rule 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Questions of law or fact common to class members predominate over any questions solely affecting individual class members and a class action is superior to other available methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating this controversy. Class action treatment will allow a large number of similarly situated class members to simultaneously and efficiently prosecute their common claims in a single forum without the needless duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would entail.
- 17. In addition, because the monetary amounts due to many individual class members are likely to be relatively small, the burden and expense of individual litigation would make it difficult, if not impossible, for individual class members to seek and obtain relief. A class action will also serve the important public interest of permitting class members harmed by Defendants' unlawful practices to effectively pursue recovery of the sums owed to them.
 - 18. Plaintiff is not aware of any difficulties that are likely to be encountered

9

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

in the management of this action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES AND OVERTIME

COMPENSATION UNDER CALIFORNIA INDUSTRIAL WELFARE

COMMISSION ORDERS AND LABOR CODE §§500, et seq., and 1194

(Against Defendants and Does 1-100

On behalf of Plaintiff and Proposed Members of the California Sub-Class)

- Plaintiff hereby realleges, and incorporates by reference as though set 19 fully forth herein, the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 18.
- Pursuant to Industrial Welfare Commission Order 4 and Labor Code 20. §§200, 500, 510, 512, 1194, and 1198, Defendants were required to compensate Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class for all hours worked, including overtime, which is calculated at one and one-half $(1\frac{1}{2})$ times the regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week, and for the first eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive work day; with double time after eight (8) hours on the seventh day of any workweek, or after 12 hours in any work day.
- 21. Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class were, and are, non-exempt employees entitled to the protections of Industrial Welfare Commission Order 4 and Labor Code §§200, 500, 510, 512, 1194, and 1198. During the course of Plaintiff's employment, and during the course of the employment of the members of the Plaintiff Class, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class for all wages and overtime hours worked as required under the California Labor Code and Code of Regulations.
- 22. Under the aforementioned wage orders, statutes, and regulations, Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class are entitled to one and one-half (11/2)

1

4 5

6

8

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

111

28

times and/or double their regular rate of pay for overtime work performed during the four (4) years preceding the filing of this Complaint, based on appropriate calculations of the "total remuneration" for each workweek.

- In violation of state law, Defendants have knowingly and willfully refused to perform their obligations to compensate Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class for all wages earned and all hours worked. As a direct result, Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class have suffered, and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages, and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform their obligations under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at time of trial, but in amounts in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this Court.
- Defendants committed the acts alleged herein knowingly and willfully, 24. with the wrongful and deliberate intention of injuring Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class, from improper motives amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights and the rights of the Plaintiff Class. Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class are thus entitled to recover nominal, actual, compensatory, punitive, and exemplary damages in amounts according to proof a time of trial, but in amounts in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this Court.
- Defendants' conduct described herein violates Industrial Welfare 25. Commission Order 4 and Labor Code §§200, 500, 510, 512 and 1198. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code §§1194, 1198, 218.6, and Civil Code §§3287 and 3289, Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of minimum wages and/or overtime compensation Defendants owe Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class, plus interest, penalties, attorney's fees, expenses, and costs of suit.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

RECOVERY OF UNPAID WAGES AT THE AGREED RATE (SECRET LOWER WAGE) *LABOR CODE* §§221-223

(Against Defendants and Does 1-100

On behalf of Plaintiff and Proposed Members of the California Sub-Class)

- 26. Plaintiff hereby realleges, and incorporates by reference as though set fully forth herein, the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 25.
- 27. Failure of an employer to pay its employees the agreed rate violates *Labor Code* §§221-223.
- 28. During the Relevant Time Period, Defendants required the members of the Class to remain under Defendants' control without paying therefor, which resulted in the members of the Class earning less than the agreed rate for portions of the days during which they worked.
- 29. Specifically, Defendants have failed to pay hourly workers an agreed upon rate by implying and enforcing a policy of requiring the Plaintiff and putative members of the Plaintiff Class to work uncompensated time "off-the-clock" in violation of California Law, including *Labor Code* §§500, *et seq.*, 1194, 1198, 221-223 and Regulations promulgated under the *Labor Code*. Defendants' policy is, and at all relevant times has been, to fail and refuse to pay wages and overtime compensation due and owing to the Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class in violation of California Law.
- 30. In addition, during the Relevant Time Period, Defendants failed to include all remuneration in calculating pay rates, which resulted in members of the Class earning less that the agreed rates for overtime and straight time.
- 31. Defendants' pattern and practice of uniformly administering a corporate policy, whereby Defendants failed to pay the agreed upon rate to the members of the Class violates *Labor Code* §§221-223 and so constitutes an unjust enrichment.

- 32. In violation of state law, Defendants have knowingly and willfully refused to perform their obligations to compensate Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class for all wages earned and all hours worked. As a direct result, Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class have suffered, and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages, and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform their obligations under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at time of trial, but in amounts in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this Court.
- 33. Defendants committed the acts alleged herein knowingly and willfully, with the wrongful and deliberate intention of injuring Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class, from improper motives amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights and the rights of the Plaintiff Class. Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class are thus entitled to recover nominal, actual, compensatory, punitive, and exemplary damages in amounts according to proof a time of trial, but in amounts in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this Court.
- 34. Defendants' conduct described herein violates Industrial Welfare Commission Order 4 and Labor Code §§221-223, in addition to Labor Code §§200, 500, 510, 512, 1194, and 1198. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code §§221-223, 1194, 1198, 218.5, 218.6, and Civil Code §§3287 and 3289, Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of agreed upon wages and/or overtime compensation based upon the agreed upon wage rate, plus interest, penalties, attorney's fees, expenses, and costs of suit.

25 | ///

///

26 | / / /

27 1//

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO COMPENSATE FOR MEAL AND REST BREAKS UNDER CALIFORNIA *LABOR CODE* §§226.7 and 512

(Against Defendants and Does 1-100

On behalf of Plaintiff and Proposed Members of the California Sub-Class).

- 35. Plaintiff hereby realleges, and incorporates by reference as though set fully forth herein, the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 34.
- 36. Labor Code §226.7(a) provides, "no employer shall require any employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission."
- 37. At all times plead herein, Defendants routinely interrupted and/or failed to permit, authorize and/or provide Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class with meal and rest breaks. By these actions Defendants violated *Labor Code* §226.7(a). At no time did the Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class expressly or impliedly waive their right to their meal or rest breaks.
- 38. As a result of the unlawful acts of the Defendants, Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class have been deprived of meal and rest breaks, and are entitled to recovery under *Labor Code* §226.7(a) in an amount of one additional hour of pay at the employees's regular rate of compensation for each work day that a meal and rest period was not provided.
- 39. Defendants committed the acts alleged herein knowingly and willfully, with the wrongful and deliberate intention of injuring Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class, from improper motives amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights and the rights of the Plaintiff Class. Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class are thus entitled to recover nominal, actual, compensatory, punitive, and exemplary damages in amounts according to proof a time of trial, but in amounts in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this Court.

Defendants' conduct described herein violates Industrial Welfare

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

40.

fees, expenses, and costs of suit. FOURTH CAUSE OF <u>ACTION</u>

CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE

FORFEITURE OF VACATION PAY IN VIOLATION OF THE

(Against Defendants and Does 1-100

On behalf of Plaintiff and Proposed Members of the California Sub-Class)

- 41. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 40 of this complaint as if fully alleged herein.
- 42. California Labor Code §227.3 makes it unlawful for an employer to cause an employee to forfeit vacation pay without compensating the employee for the vacation time at the rate of pay in effect at the time of forfeiture.
- During the applicable limitations period, Defendants caused Plaintiff 43. to forfeit vested paid vacation days without providing monetary compensation for it based on his rate of pay in effect at that time. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants have maintained a policy or practice of causing members of the California Vacation Pay Class to forfeit vested paid vacation days without compensating them for forfeited days based on their rates of pay in effect at the time of forfeiture.
- As a result of the above, Plaintiff seeks damages, restitution, plus interest, penalties, attorney's fees, expenses, and costs of suit, on behalf of both himself and the other class members for forfeited vacation days in amounts subject

1 to proof.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE AN "ACCURATE" ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENT UPON PAYMENT OF WAGES IN VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 226

(Against Defendants and Does 1-100

On behalf of Plaintiff and Proposed Members of the California Sub-Class)

- Plaintiff hereby realleges, and incorporates by reference as though set fully forth herein, the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 44.
- 46. Labor Code §226(a) sets forth reporting requirements for employers when they pay wages, as follows: "Every employer shall ... at the time of each payment of wages, furnish his or her employees ... an itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned; (2) total hours worked by the employee...(3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis...." Section (e) provides: "An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) shall be entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4000), and shall be entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney's fees."
- 47. Defendants failed to accurately record the hours worked by Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class.
- 48. Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class request recovery of *Labor Code* §226(e) penalties according to proof, as well as interest, attorney's fees and costs pursuant to *Labor Code* §226(e), in a sum as provided by the *Labor Code*

and/or other statutes.

2

1

3

4 5

6 7

8

1011

13 14

12

16

17

15

18

19

20 | 21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY COMPENSATION AT THE TIME OF TERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA

LABOR CODE §§201-203

(Against Defendants and Does 1-100 On Behalf of the California Plaintiff and Proposed Members of the California Terminated Sub-Class)

- 49. Plaintiff hereby realleges, and incorporates by reference as though set fully forth herein, the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 48.
- California Labor Code §201 requires an employer who discharges an 50. employee to pay compensation due and owing to said employee immediately upon discharge. California Labor Code §202 requires an employer to promptly pay compensation due and owing to an employee within 72 hours of that employee's termination of employment by resignation. California Labor Code §203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay compensation promptly upon discharge or resignation in a prompt and timely manner as required pursuant to California Labor Code §201 and §202 respectively, said employer is liable to said employee for a waiting time wage continuation as described herein. Defendants' willful failure to pay former employee Plaintiff and members of the Terminated Sub-Class all of the wages due and owing them constitutes violations of Labor Code §§201 and 203, which provides that an employee's wages will continue as a waiting time wage continuation up to thirty (30) days from the time the wages were due. Therefore, Plaintiff and members of the Terminated Sub-Class are entitled to a waiting time wage continuation pursuant to Labor Code §203.
- 51. Plaintiff and members of the Terminated Sub-Class were previously employed by Defendants and were terminated within the Relevant Time Period as set forth above. Defendants failed to pay all wages due to this sub-class at the

6

13

16

17 18

20

19

22

21

23 24

25

26 27

28

time of termination, and, in addition, failed to pay all wages due in a timely manner as mandated by California *Labor Code* §§201-203.

Plaintiff and members of the Terminated Sub-Class seek wages, 52. penalties, plus costs, interest, disbursements and attorneys fees pursuant to California law, including but not limited to Labor Code §§218.5, 218.6, and Civil Code §§3287 and 3289.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION IN VIOLATION OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

(Against Defendants and Does 1-100

On behalf of Plaintiff and Proposed Members of the Plaintiff Class)

- Plaintiff hereby realleges, and incorporates by reference as though set 53. fully forth herein, the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 52.
- 54. The Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §201, et seq., states that an employee must be compensated for all hours worked, including all straight time compensation and overtime compensation. 29 C.F.R. §778.223 and 29 C.F.R. §778.315. This Court has concurrent jurisdiction over claims involving the Fair Labor Standards Act pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §216.
- Plaintiff also brings this lawsuit as a collective action under the Fair 55. Labor Standards Act, 29 US.C. §201, et seq. (the 'FLSA"), on behalf of all persons who were, are, or will be employed by Defendants in a non-exempt hourly position during the period commencing three years prior to the filing of this Complaint to and through a date of judgment, who performed work in excess of forty (40) hours in one week and did not receive all compensation as required by the FLSA for the hours worked. To the extent equitable, tolling operates to toll claims by the against the collective employees against the Defendants, the collective statute of limitations should be adjusted accordingly.

- 56. Questions of law and fact common to collective employees as a whole include, but are not limited to the following:
- a. Whether Defendants' policies and practices failed to accurately record all hours worked by Plaintiff and other collective employees;
- b. Whether Defendants' policies and practices were to write down the time worked by Plaintiff and collective employees;
- c. Whether Defendants failed to adequately compensate collective employees for all hours worked as required by the FLSA, including the time worked through their meal and rest periods;
- d. Whether Defendants failed to include all remuneration in calculating the appropriate rates for overtime and straight time;
- e. Whether Defendants should be enjoined from continuing the practices which violate the FLSA; and,
 - f. Whether Defendants are liable to the collective employees.
- 57. The Seventh Cause of Action for the violations of the FLSA may be brought and maintained as an "opt-in" collection action pursuant to Section 16(b) of FLSA, 29 U.S.C. 216(b), for all claims asserted by the representative Plaintiff because the claims of Plaintiff are similar to the claims of collective employees.
- 58. Plaintiff and collective employees are similarly situated, have substantially similar job requirements and pay provisions, and are subject to Defendants' common and uniform policy and practice of failing to pay for all actual time worked and wages earned, failing to accurately record all hours worked by these employees in violation of the FLSA and the Regulations implementing the Act as enacted by the Secretary of Labor, and for failing to include all remuneration in calculating overtime rates and straight time rates of employees.

- 59. Defendants are engaged in communication, business, and transmission throughout the United States and are, therefore, engaged in commerce within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. §203(b).
- 60. 29 U.S.C. §225 provides that a three-year statute of limitations applies to willful violations of the FLSA. The conduct by the Defendants which violated the FLSA was willful.
- 61. Plaintiff and collective employees regularly worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek. Pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §201, et seq., Plaintiff and collective employees are entitled to compensation for all hours actually worked, and are also entitled to wages at a rate not less than one and one-half times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in any workweek.
- 62. Plaintiff and collective employees were all paid by Defendants on an hourly or salary basis for the hours worked up to forty (40) in a workweek, but Plaintiff and collective employees worked more than forty (40) hours per workweek, and were not paid compensation for all hours worked, including overtime hours. Defendants also failed to pay Plaintiff, and collective employees, compensation for the hours they worked performing duties primarily for the benefit of the employer during meal and rest periods.
- 63. For purposes of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the employment practices of Defendants were and are uniform throughout California and the United States in all respects material to the claims asserted in this Complaint.
- 64. Defendants violated the Fair Labor Standards Act by failing to pay hourly employees for all hours worked, including overtime hours, as alleged herein above.
- 65. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay overtime compensation for hours worked, as required by the FLSA, Plaintiff and collective employees were

damaged in an amount to be proved at trial.

66. Plaintiff, therefore, demands that he and collective employees be paid overtime compensation as required by the FLSA for every hour of overtime in any workweek for which they were not compensated, compensation for meal and rest periods, compensation for miscalculation of overtime and straight time, plus liquidated damages, interest and statutory costs as provided by law.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION CONVERSION

(Against Defendants and Does 1-100

On behalf of Plaintiff and Proposed Members of the Plaintiff Class)

- 67. Plaintiff hereby realleges, and incorporates by reference as though set fully forth herein, the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 66.
- 68. Defendants knowingly and intentionally required Plaintiff, and other similarly situated employees to perform "off-the-clock" work and failed to pay them the minimum wages due, and/or agreed upon wages due, and/or overtime.
- 69. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to allow and pay for meal and rest breaks.
- 70. Defendants withheld the earned wages/overtime wages, pay for meal and rest breaks and exercised dominion and control over them such as to convert these withheld wages which Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class owned or had the right to own, and had the legal right to hold, possess, and dispose.
- 71. Defendants knowingly, willfully, and unlawfully interfered with the Plaintiff and the rights of all of the members of all of the Plaintiff Class to own, possess, and/or control the disposition of said wages and overtime wages. Said actions constitute a criminal misdemeanor violation of Labor Code § 206.5.
- 72. The exact amount of wages and overtime wages earned by Plaintiff and each of the members of the Class here alleged, is identifiable even though the

14

15

23 24

25 26

27

28

specific sum of money each Plaintiff and each of the members of the Plaintiff Class may vary by individual.

- In refusing to pay wages and overtime owed to Plaintiff and the members of the Plaintiff Class, Defendants knowingly, unlawfully, and intentionally took, appropriated, and converted the property of Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class here alleged for Defendants' own use, purpose, and benefits.
- Plaintiff, and all similarly situated persons in the class, have been 74. injured by said conversion in the amount of the monies converted by the Defendants, with interest thereon from that time.
- Defendants' actions constituting conversion were oppressive, 75. malicious and fraudulent. As such, Plaintiff and all similarly situated persons are entitled to punitive and exemplary damages. Plaintiff further seeks on behalf of the general public, the appointment of a receiver, as necessary to establish the total monetary relief sought from Defendants.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE §17200

(Against Defendants and Does 1-100

On behalf of Plaintiff and Proposed Members of the Plaintiff Class)

- Plaintiff hereby realleges, and incorporates by reference as though set 76. fully herein, the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 75.
- By violating the statutes and regulations set forth in this Complaint, 77. and incorporated by reference hereto, and unfairly failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class all wages (minimum wage, overtime, agreed upon wages, and meals and breaks) earned and owing. Defendants' acts constitute unfair and unlawful business practices under Business and Professions Code

proof at the time of trial.

78. Defendants' violations of California wage and hour laws and illegal payroll practices or payment policies constitute a business practice because it was

done repeatedly over a significant period of time, and in a systematic manner to the detriment of Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class.

79. For the four (4) years preceding the filing of this action, Plaintiff and members of the Plaintiff Class have suffered damages and request restitution of all monies and profits to be disgorged from Defendants in an amount according to

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT

(By Plaintiff and Proposed Members of the California Sub-Classes)

- 80. Plaintiff hereby realleges, and incorporates by reference as though set fully forth herein, the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 79.
- 81. During the Relevant Time Period, Defendants violated California *Labor Code* §§201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512 and 1194.
- 82. California *Labor Code* §§2699(a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee, on behalf of himself and other current or former employees, to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures specified in California *Labor Code* § 2699.3.
- 83. Pursuant to California *Labor Code* §§2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff and other members of the California Civil Penalties Class are entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants' violations of California *Labor Code* §§201, 202, 203, 204, 223, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512 and 1194 during the applicable limitations period in the following amounts:
 - A. For violations of California Labor Code §§201, 202, 203 and

1194, one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation (penalty amounts established by California Labor Code § 2699(f)(2));

- B. For violations of California *Labor Code* §204, one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each aggrieved employee for each subsequent, willful or intentional violation (penalty amounts established by California *Labor Code* §210);
- C. For violations of California Labor Code § 223, one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each aggrieved employee for each subsequent, willful or intentional violation (penalty amounts established by California *Labor Code* §225.5);
- D. For violations of California *Labor Code* §227.3, one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation (penalty amounts established by California *Labor Code* §2699(f)(2));
- E. For violations of California *Labor Code* §226(a), two hundred fifty (\$250.00) per employee for initial violation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000.00) per employee for each subsequent violation (penalty amounts established by California *Labor Code* § 226.3); and,
- F. For violations of California *Labor Code* §§510 and 512, fifty dollars (\$50.00) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation for pay

7

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

21

20

22 23

24

25

26

27

period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover unpaid wages and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover unpaid wages (penalty amounts established by California Labor Code § 558).

- Plaintiff is currently in the process of complying with the procedures 84. for bringing suit specified in California Labor Code §2699.3. By letter dated September 24, 2009, Plaintiff gave written notice by certified mail to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.
- Pursuant to California Labor Code §2699(g), Plaintiff and the other 85. class members are entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs in connection with their claims for civil penalties.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- An order that the action be certified as a class action; A.
- An order that Plaintiff be appointed class representative; В.
- An order that counsel for Plaintiff be appointed class counsel; C.
- An order allowing notice to proceed with respect to Plaintiff's D. Seventh Cause of Action to persons who are similarly situated to Plaintiff;
- E. Damages;
- F. Restitution;
- Civil penalties; G.
- Η Statutory penalties;

COMPLAINT CASE NO.

Case 8:09-cv-01168-CJC-RNB Document 1 Filed 10/09/09 Page 28 of 32

Case 8:09-cv-01168-CJC-RNB Document 1 Filed 10/09/09 Page 20 R G NAL UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself □) JOHN S. PAULINO and all others similarly situated		DEFENDANTS BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION, a D	A, NATIO	NAL ASSOCIATION orporation; and DOES	i; BANK OF AMERICA S 1 to 100, inclusive	A
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number. If you are yourself, provide same.) Stanley D. Saltzman, Esq.; Louis M. Marlin, Esq.; Marcus J. Bradle Christina A. Humphrey, Esq.; MARLIN & SALTZMAN, 29229 C	ey, Esq.;	Attorneys (If Known)	. <u>-</u>			
Street, Suite 208 Agoura Hills, CA, 91301 (818) 991-8080 II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an X in one box only.)	III. CITIZENS	HIP OF PRINCIPAL P	ARTIES	For Diversity Cases	Only	<u></u>
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff ☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S.	(Place an X		PŢF DE	F		DEF
Government Not a Party)	Citizen of This S	State	ce 1 □ 1	Incorporated or P of Business in thi	s State	□ 4
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Anoth	ner State	□2 □2	Incorporated and of Business in Ar	r	▼ 5
	Citizen or Subje	ct of a Foreign Country	□3 □3	Foreign Nation	<u> </u>	□6
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in one box only.)						
E : 01.6	einstated or	Transferred from anothe	er district (specify): □6 Mult Distr Litig	ict Judge from	
V. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: JURY DEMAND: Yes	No (Check 'Yes'	only if demanded in con	nplaint.)			
CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.P. 23: Yes No		MONEY DEMANDED 1				
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you Labor Code Secs. 500, et seq.; 201-203, 221-223, 226, 226.7, 512,	are filing and writ	te a brief statement of cau	ise. Do no	t cite jurisdictional sta	itutes unless diversity.)	
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one box only.)	1194, 2002, Bus. (& Fior. Code Sees. 17200	, or soq., v	venue commission	J14015	-
		торто		PRISONER	LABOR	
Official	TORTS RSONAL INJURY	TORTS PERSONAL		PETITIONS	▼710 Fair Labor Stan	ndards
1 400 Dutte Reapportioniment 1 110 Insurance) Airplane	PROPERTY	□ 51	0 Motions to	Act	
□ 430 Banks and Banking □ 130 Miller Act □ 315	Airplane Produc	i — ·		Vacate Sentence	☐ 720 Labor/Mgmt.	
☐ 450 Commerce/ICC ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability Assault, Libel &	☐ 371 Truth in Len		Habeas Corpus	Relations	
Rates/etc.	Slander			30 General 35 Death Penalty	☐ 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting &	
☐ 460 Deportation Overpayment & ☐ 330 ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced Enforcement of) Fed. Employers'				Disclosure Act	t
and Corrent Judgment	Liability	Product Liab	ility	Other	□ 740 Railway Labor	Act
Organizations	Marine Marine Product	BANKRUPTCY		0 Civil Rights	☐ 790 Other Labor	
☐ 480 Consumer Credit ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	☐ 422 Appeal 28 U 158	SC 53	55 Prison Condition	Litigation ☐ 791 Empl, Ret. Inc.	
	Motor Vehicle	□ 423 Withdrawal		PENALTY	Security Act	•
□ 850 Securities/Commodities/ □ 153 Recovery of	 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 	TICC 157		0 Agriculture	PROPERTY RIGH	ITS
	Other Personal	CIVIL RIGHTS	□ 62	Other Food &	□ 820 Copyrights	
□ 875 Customer Challenge 12 Veteran's Benefits	Injury	☐ 441 Voting	.	Drug 25 Drug Related	☐ 830 Patent ☐ 840 Trademark	
USC 3410	Personal Injury-			Seizure of	SOCIAL SECURI	TY
	Med Malpractic Personal Injury-	Υ I			□ 861 HIA (1395ff)	
□ 892 Economic Stabilization Liability	Product Liability	y □ 444 Welfare	L.	881	□ 862 Black Lung (92	
	3 Asbestos Person	al 445 American wi Disabilities		30 Liquor Laws 40 R.R. & Truck	□ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	
□ 893 Environmental Matters □ 894 Energy Allocation Act □ 210 Land Condemnation	Injury Product Liability	Employment		50 Airline Regs	864 SSID Title XV	'I
	IMMIGRATION			60 Occupational	□ 865 RSI (405(g))	MC000000000000000000000000000000000000
☐ 900 Appeal of Fee Determi- ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 462	2 Naturalization	Disabilities -		Safety /Health	FEDERAL TAX SU	
nation Under Equal 240 Torts to Land	Application 3 Habeas Corpus-	Other ☐ 440 Other Civil	□ 69	Other	□ 870 Taxes (U.S. Pla or Defendant)	ainuff
Access to Justice 245 Tort Product Liability 2403 950 Constitutionality of 290 All Other Real Property	Alien Detainee	Rights			□ 871 IRS-Third Part	ty 26
State Statutes	Other Immigrati	on			USC 7609	•
	Actions			_		
	<u></u>		SAG	709-0	1168	
				/	- 100	

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number:

Case 8:09-cv-01168-CJC-RNB Document 1 Filed 10/09/09 Page 30 of 32 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has If yes, list case number(s):	this action been pre	eviously filed in this court and dismissed, remanded or closed?		
,,	any cases been prev	viously filed in this court that are related to the present case? No Yes		
Civil cases are deemed related if a p (Check all boxes that apply) B. (C C. I	Arise from the same Call for determination For other reasons we	e and the present case: or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or on of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or ould entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or tent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.		
IX. VENUE: (When completing the	following information	on, use an additional sheet if necessary.)		
(a) List the County in this District; Check here if the government, it	California County ou s agencies or employ	utside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. yees is a named plaintiff. If this box is checked, go to item (b).		
County in this District:*		California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country		
Orange		N/A		
(b) List the County in this District; C Check here if the government, it	California County ou s agencies or employ	atside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. yees is a named defendant. If this box is checked, go to item (c).		
County in this District:*		California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country		
Orange		N/A		
(c) List the County in this District; C Note: In land condemnation ca		utside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose. n of the tract of land involved.		
County in this District:*		California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country		
Orange		N/A		
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernar Note: In land condemnation cases, us	dino, Riverside, Ve	entura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo Counties tragt of land involved		
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (Mustina a. Murphey Date October 8, 2009		
Notice to Counsel/Parties: The or other papers as required by law	e CV-71 (JS-44) Ci	vil Cover Sheet and the information contained berein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings ed by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)		
Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases:				
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action		
861	НІА	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))		
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)		
863	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))			
863	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))			
864 SSID All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Se				

CV-71 (05/08) CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 2 of 2

All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42

Act, as amended.

U.S.C. (g))

RSI

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Cormac J. Carney	and the assigned
discovery Magistrate Judge is Robert N. Block.	

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

SACV09- 1168 CJC (RNBx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge
NOTICE TO COUNSEL
A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

Ш	western Division			
	312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8			
	Los Angeles, CA 90012			

[X] Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516

Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501
KIVEISIUE, OA 3200 I

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

Case 8:09-cv-01168-CJC-RNB Docum	nent 1 Filed 10/09/09 Page 32 of 32
Name & Address:	
Stanley D. Saltzman, Esq. (SBN 90058)	
Louis M. Marlin, Esq. (SBN 54053)	
MARLIN & SALTZMAN	
29229 Canwood Street, Suite 208	
Agoura Hills, CA 91301	
CENTRAL DISTRIC	DISTRICT COURT TOF CALIFORNIA
JOHN S. PALLANO and all others similarly situated	CASE NUMBER
	ACV09-01168 CJC (RNBX)
PLAINTIFF(S)	MCANA OTTO
v.	
BANK OF AMERICA, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION;	
BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION, a Delaware	SUMMONS
corporation; and DOES 1 to 10′ inclusive	Semments
DEFENDANT(S).	
TO: DEFENDANT(S): BANK OF AMERICA (A) CORPORATION; and DOES (to 100) inclusive	ONAL ASSOCIATION; BANK OF AMERICA
CORPORATION; and DOES Ato 1000 inclusive	3
-OB OLL	
A lawsuit has been it a against you.	
Within 20 days after service of this summor	ns on you (not counting the day you received it), you
must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached ☑ counterclaim ☐ cross-claim or a motion under Rule 1:	omplaint amended complaint
or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, Ch	
29229 Canwood Street, Suite 208, Agoura Hills, CA, 91	. If you fail to do so,
judgment by default will be entered against you for the r	
your answer or motion with the court.	Clerk, U.S. District Court SHEA BOURGEOIS Deputy Clerk
	Clerk, U.S. District Court
0 9 DCT 2009	a afflue
Dated:	B. SHEA BOURGEOIS
	(Seal of the Court) SEAL
[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United States	e against or is an officer or amployee of the United States. Allowed
60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)].	agency, or is an officer or emproyee of the emica states. Stronous
	40
277.017.7020	
CV-01A (12/07) SUMM	LUNS